









## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The other item is reference material and is the full assessment report conducted. We hired a team of professional architects and engineers that conducted with their subject matter expertise, looking at what the issues with that facility would be, long-term to regain its operational endeavor.

That then essentially sets us at a \$3,500,000 starting number for what we would be required to pay out of pocket. Additionally, as we mentioned, there's a \$500,000 component of deductible and we've already spent \$250,000 to essentially emergency restore it to, so it didn't further damage the building itself. There would be additional insurance proceeds available to us if we proceeded with additional repairs. However, we don't know how much more repairs we would identify through that process, and so that's why we're talking about, we know that we would've to spend at least \$3,500,000 and we believe there's potential for another \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 that would not be covered through insurance if we move forward with the repairs.

Mr. Konrad asked that of the \$5,500,000 to 6,500,000 repair cost, does staff consider that to be bond funds that would be needed to make those repairs or would those be classified as some other operating or cash fund from a sources standpoint?

Mr. Foutz replied that he thinks ultimately we determine what the total price is going to be and what direction we would like to take the school district currently, the items that would be available to us as Fund 315, which are the bond funds, however, we don't have a project approved for that as today. The other option would potentially be Fund 340, which is government service tax funds. However, we tried to keep that to particular projects that are related to shorter lifespans. Building a new school would be well beyond the five-year lifespan that we typically try to keep those projects under.

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked if there had been an updated facility conditioning index (FCI) number post the storm or was there an assessment done?

Mr. McLaughlin stated that we go through one-fifth of our inventory when we conduct the FCI. The last FCI for was conducted before that five-year window. Their five-year would have been this year, so it would have been inaccurate to capture the current state of it.

Ms. Williams asked how many students are currently enrolled at Lundy Elementary School and what the capacity was.

Mr. Goudie stated that there are 10 students enrolled for this current year and the capacity is 48.

Ms. Williams asked how many students potentially would occupy the school if it was rebuilt.

Mr. Baldwin said that two of the 10 students that were previously enrolled were in fifth grade and have now into middle school. Six students of the remaining nine that reside in Mount Charleston are all currently going into third grade. In 2 years those third graders will move into middle school. We've heard of one kindergarten student that is planning to enroll, but as of yesterday, I have not seen that student's registration submitted yet. That would leave a very low number of students.

Ms. Williams asked how long it would take students to travel from Mount Charleston to Indian Springs.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Goudy stated that according to data from the transportation group, Indian Springs is routed with a transit time of 70 minutes in both the morning and the afternoon each way.

Ms. Williams asked Mr. Goudy what he meant by transitioning meaningful traditions and artifacts from Lundy to Indian Springs.

Mr. Goudy stated that CCSD is inquiring the parents of the students to understand if there are traditions or specific artifacts at Lundy that are more meaningful that we can transition. We understand that the name of the school is very important and as part of the Board regulation, the name Earl B. Lundy takes priority future remaining potentials.

Mr. Camejo stated that he had real numbers as to how many students would be attending Lundy if it were open today and that he got these numbers from talking to the community. He went on to say that there are seven children under the age of two and nine children that are in pre-K. He said there was 10 students at Lundy and 7 that are homeschooled potentially. He said there are anywhere between 26 to almost 30 elementary students that should be attending Lundy Elementary School if it was open. He stated that these were numbers that he found out by talking to the community, something the school district has not done.

He went on to say that utilities and trash are estimated at \$28,867. This information is available from the school district itself. Lundy carryover money is \$417,732. Other funds are \$27,372, a total of \$995,314 to be exact Lundy cost per pupil with carryover money is \$76,563. The carryover money per pupil minus all this is \$41,256. It seems to me that Lundy can pay its own repairs to remain open.

Mr. DeFalco asked if this presentation was given to members of the community at Lundy.

Mr. Goudy said that CCSD had a separate meeting which they were invited to but there was a separate meeting held at Mount Charleston at the same time CCSD was hosting the one at Indian Springs.

Mr. DeFalco remarked that there was an opportunity for the public to learn just like we are now.

Mr. Goudy said that Mr. DeFalco was correct.

Mr. DeFalco asked if we have any ideas on what this building could be used for if it were to close down in the future.

Mr. Goudy replied that the Board has not yet determined whether the school will close or not. We have reached out to the community to have discussions around potential use of that property in the future if it is closed. Additionally, staff has had meetings with different county commissioners who have expressed an interest in discussing what potential there may be in the future as well.

Mr. DeFalco asked if we are ready or in a position to have conversations in public about what people are wanting there yet.

Mr. Goudy answered that CCSD's Government Relations is reaching out to the community and obtaining input. We plan to present this to the Board next week and the Government Relations team is working with the public to try to get those to see if there is anything we can present at that point.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. DeFalco stated that one of the best things we do as a school district is our finances. He said that we are extremely lucky to have Mr. Goudy in the position that he's in. He had previous conversations with employees in the State Treasurer's Office and they said that finances and bonds are something that the school district does best. He asked that from that perspective, as the expert, how important is it at this moment, at a time of rising costs, inflation, construction costs, material costs, labor costs for the school district to have an opportunity to save money?

Mr. Goudy said that Mr. DeFalco was right and that one of the members earlier made that comment that we have to be very cautious about what we're doing going forward. Inflation rates have been out of control nationwide. In construction here, as Mr. Foutz mentioned, we're up just for materials alone 43%. We've seen schools go from costing between \$29,000,000 to \$30,000,000, to \$50,000,000. As we've mentioned, we are going to have significant changes necessary with CIP 6 and CIP 7. CIP 6 is a shortened version because of the increase in costs and making sure that we do evaluate every dollar that we spend and try to ensure that we can get the most out of it. It's paramount at this point. From a capital perspective, we talk about a \$12,000,000,000 to \$13,000,000,000 need and we have bonding capacity of just over \$7,000,000,000. We will never in this district not have the need of continuing to bond to ensure that we can keep schools open, refurbish, remodel, rebuild, etc.

Luckily, we were able to get our bonds, the bonding capacity pushed through to 2035, which is huge. But that means we have to start thinking about how we get that moved forward as early as 2030 again, so that we don't run into the position that we've been in the past where we don't have bonding capacity because there is no way that we could continue to survive that.

Regulation 7113, which pertains to the closing of schools, was read into record.

Mr Lopez opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Chris Giunchigliani's public comment is as follows:

Thank you Mr. Chair and members of the committee. Prior to making a recommendation to close or change the function of the school, you just read into the record and that was the first line of my notes. None of those studies have been done, not one, two, or three nor have you had a community meeting on the mountain as requested by our neighbors. 60 people showed up to ours. Only five people showed up to the Indian Springs meeting and they were all from Indian Springs. Parents and teachers were notified 30 days prior to closure. However, CCSD chose to wait to notify on May 10th just before summer vacation. Yet they knew prior to January 18 they intended to close Lundy. Therefore, they didn't meet the 30 day timeline and their school projections for 24-25.

They zeroed out the students. They have never bothered to offer or do a headcount of the pre-K students which are nine nor those that chose homeschooling versus a three hour bus ride. They just stopped communicating with those parents who had to deal with the special and circumstances of a flood Further. CCSD rezoned students further away and didn't bother to at least send the students to Bilbray or Sherkenbach for the 23-24 school year. CCSD also never brought the zone change to AZAC nor to the parents. Why is Lundy no longer listed as a school, even a school in CCSD on the 24-25 school precinct funding report? An assessment was set up by Ethos Three. They contracted with Wood Rogers and Wright engineers. They issued their report. This one that's here today, which has never been given to you until today. They were paid \$124,500. Ethos did his onsite walk around as did right on page 51, right Engineer state.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

My observations were limited to the southeast portion of the building where the damage occurred. The southeast portion was the kiln and storage. It's not part of the school. Page 53 of the assessment document also from Wright Engineers said In our professional opinion, the main structure may be occupied when the temporary measure of supporting the storage room is complete. That was completed by Martin Harris in December for a tune of \$120,684.27. Part of the report talks about a kiln room that was never even part of the building. It's not been used in seven years. The storage room is not necessary to the building. This report that I had to request through a FOIA where they illegally redacted information, which is also redacted in yours as well, was not shared with this bond oversight committee nor the board of trustees. They've had it since September 15th of last year.

Why wasn't it a public hearing? None of the trustees or bond members have been able to go to the building. You've been denied. At least I know at least one of you has. The report also says the septic system may need to be repaired, but you redacted the map of its location. SNHD and NDEP can't even find your permit. The police and firefighters have used this facility all year long until you canceled their lease after May 10th. Why was it safe for them but not the students? Why haven't we seen a written damage and cost report? Why have we not been able to discuss these options like adults? Why can't we do a walkthrough with the engineers? Why is CCSD citing that it's too costly, an excuse to not provide an equitable education to a rural school. Why have you bothered to physically get a count of the students? What's next? Good Springs. Reed, Blue Diamond? Rural schools should be protected, not abandoned. Thank you. Oh, and I have a handout.

Ms. Brenda Talley's public comment was as follows:

In August, a team of professional engineers were assembled to assess the damage to our school. Their report indicates the repairs needed to reopen. I won't go over all the ones that Chris did. The district's list of repairs aren't consistent with the reports and still we have not received any documentation for the cost of repairs from the district. From the damage report, this is what we see needs to be repaired and what doesn't. The propane tanks, they need to be relocated. One HVAC unit replaced. The kiln room does not need to be replaced because the kiln is gone and hadn't been used for years. Replaced the parking lot. Parking lot has just been filled. Just needs paving. Second floor weight room presentation of the still beam shown in their presentation, the crack they replacement of roof support beams. However, the report photo clearly shows the back securely attached and it states it is intact and no movement shown. Its preexisting condition and condition acceptable. No repairs needed. There again, the weight room. There was two wood beams had a crack report. States appears preexisting and engineer states in the professional opinion, no repairs needed for any of these items in the weight room. Water remediation and repair. The report photos show main entry with some minor water, mud damage, replace carpeting. Your presentation states to replace flooring for water damage throughout yet. Photos in the report of the cracks and flooring show no water damage. And the photos we took through the Windows show no water damage at all may be replace the flooring later. And she talked about stabilizing the southeast corner and they said the building could be occupied when that was done and elevations were checked twice and no settling found. And per the engineers, the building can be occupied.

The septic system needs to be replaced. Report recommends when water power are restored, temporary toilet facilities are an option until the system is completed. I confirmed water district has restored water to the building, the drainage realignment. We don't believe that should be the district's total responsibility. There may be funding available to assist here. We have support from our federal and state legislators. Our governor, the county commissioners have asked the district to work with them to see what they could help with there. The district's first responsibility is to provide our kids, all kids an education with equality and



## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

equity. Not one in which studies show impacts to the children, not only academically but health-wise with a bus ride and it's almost three and a half hours with the stop. I have followed the bus one day round trip and the early pickup time of six o'clock in the morning. These kids are getting up at five o'clock when we talk to them at our meeting, they said they're falling asleep in the class, not just on the bus. Retract the recommendation for closure, get the actual cost and let's get this school repaired and opened instead of balancing the budget on the backs of these young kids.

Mr. Ed Courtney's public comment was as follows:

Hello, my name's Ed Courtney. I'm the son of Francis H. Cortney of Francis H. Cortney Middle School. I've lived here since 1964. When growing up we had a cabin in Mount Charleston from 1979 on. I owned the lot across from Lundy Elementary School. I think it'd be a travesty to close this school. I grew up knowing kids that went to this school. It was a huge benefit to have this school in their community. When we talk about school, I think we have to talk about the school as an educational institution, but also as a fabric of the community. And I think if you look at this school, it is part of the community. It is a fabric of that community in Mount Charleston in Old Town, and it has been for decades.

I think if you close this school, like I said, you'd be doing an injustice. Part of the problem with making these kids travel 70 minutes on a bus, these kids are still suffering from the effects of the COVID shutdowns and all of that. If you close this, you're only making it harder for these elementary school kids to get a good education, to get a good night's sleep, get up, have a good breakfast, get to school, and have a good education. I think what we're talking about is a drop in the bucket compared to the size and scope of the Clark County School District. I mean, I just think again, you'd be doing a disservice to the community. And I also have to question, I heard in the back about \$5,500,000 to \$6,500,000, but we haven't entered the building yet. So I don't even know how you can arrive at that figure if you haven't even entered the building yet. It seems absurd to me. I've been in construction for 40 years and I've heard all these numbers tossed around about \$11,000,000 \$8,000,000. And I've looked at the school and I'm going, I don't know where they're getting these numbers from or who they're hiring to do this, but that's insane.

If it costs that much, then it's not inflation, it's mismanaged. It's you're just not hiring the right people. But that's all I have. I just implore you to really explore this issue. I think it's extremely important for the kids. I think they deserve to have an elementary school in their community just like everyone else in this community. Thank you.

### **2.07 2015 Capital Improvement Program Revision 6.**

This presentation went over the economic realities since Revision 5, marketplace saturation, and district enrollment trends.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that rising construction costs have been a predominant theme throughout the last several months. We definitely wanted to start to react to that sooner rather than later. Therefore, Revision 6 is being brought forward with a few pretenses that we know are going on in the marketplace that would make a lot of sense. It is also being brought forward due to the economic realities since Revision 5 was brought forward in 2021 for the trustees acknowledging some of those as well as the marketplace saturation that's ongoing and Mr. Baldwin's presentation in April surrounding on district enrollment trends.

Mr. Foutz said that as stated earlier, production prices and material costs have gone up 42.1%. What we built an elementary school for back in 2019 and 2020, cost the district \$31,500,000 to \$32,000,000 They're

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

currently going to cost us \$49,000,000 to \$50,000,000. Part of that is obviously the building material cost. We want to flatten these construction projects out due to construction labor costs. The other component to this is marketplace saturation.

Mr. Baldwin reviewed enrollment trends. He stated that there are 3 decision points within Revision 6. Number one is the site of elementary school location 1 of 10 in the northwest near Skye Canyon Park Drive and Shaumber Road. There were ten brand new elementary schools included in Revision 5. We're just recommending the first of those ten be cited in an area with increased students moving into those areas.

Item number two is for the construction of a new innovative academy high school in the southwest. If you recall, Revisions 3, 4, and 5 have all had a high school in this proposed location. I think that clearly demonstrates there is a high school need. If you look at Desert Oasis and Sierra Vista high schools alone, they're at 123 and 125% capacity. The problem that we observed as staff was there was a 2,700 seat high school plan for this. Those are 40-acre full tilt comprehensive high schools with all the fields and all the amenities. If we built a school like that, though Desert Oasis and Sierra Vista are overcrowded, it would sit half-vacant for the foreseeable future. So to the point of an earlier comment, it certainly wouldn't be maybe the most prudent of our resources.

Ms. Gia Moore, Assistant Superintendent of College and Career Readiness and School Choice, stated that we were really trying to research some options to prepare students for jobs that don't yet exist. This new school gives us the opportunity to do that with the Innovation Academy. Students will be engaging in personalized learning, critical thinking, design thinking, learning about concepts of adaptability, but all through this lens of project-based learning and experiential learning and then focusing also on product design entrepreneurship.

Ms. Gia Moore, Assistant Superintendent of College and Career Readiness and School Choice, stated that we're looking at having a robust partnership with our business and industry and the stars are kind of aligning with this project in that the southwest has been identified as an innovation corridor. Some key features of the school that we are looking at to really facilitate that program is immersive labs and tactile labs. Students will get a wide array of experiences at the school. As well as, the opportunity to take dual enrollment to be college and career ready upon graduation.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that the programming of this is going to be very forward-looking both from a curricular and a facility front. It could be a model that gets replicated long-term with us. So decision number three is to defer all project openings one year from school year 2027, 2028 and beyond, with the exception of Matt Kelly Elementary School. There's a lot of work out there and we're starting to see some of that selectivity by some of our contractors. So being able to ratchet down, be very strategic about it is maybe a goal that we want to have in this revision, in this recommendation in particular. We're going to enter into and in coordination with the chair and the trustee moving forward, there is an annual cycle we'd like to get into where we do work collaboratively with the BOC, developing focus areas, scenarios, holding public meetings to hear some of the actions that the bond oversight committee will bring forward to the trustees as recommendations and ultimately having the committee work with us and those recommendations to the trustees.

And then last but not least, we certainly want to acknowledge that the interim superintendent position until filled is a voice that should be part of that facility master plan. This plan allows that hire to happen. And then as well the board's future vision with Focus 2024 now concluded and the board currently setting their vision in the near future here, we want a facility master plan that's in alignment with both that superintendent that's

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

selected and that future board vision. This plan is not created in a vacuum and separate and apart from that. So pushing the project timelines a year allows us to not make 100 million, 200 million commitments that we might not want to be making as a District and as a committee. So this allows for some room to breathe, to make sure we reprioritize that Capital Improvement Plan.

Mr. McLaughlin said that South CTA is scheduled to open in the summer of 2025.

Mr. DeFalco asked what the tentative opening date for the elementary school.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that by conservative estimates the school could be open as early as the 2028-2029 school year.

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked what flexibility staff has in response to a situation where you feel the bid is coming in way too high.

Mr. McLaughlin said that we have contingency in our budgets when we bring forward recommendations to this committee and the BOST.

Ms. Blackman Taylor stated that there could be anticipation that some of the later projects could be altered depending on what a new superintendent or new BOST looks to amend or add or take away from the future revision.

Mr. McLaughlin said that those two bodies would have heavy voices along with the masterplan and the community.

The floor was open for Public Comment.

Chris Giunchigliani's public comments was as follows:

I just wanted sitting here hearing about the bids coming in high. Have you reviewed 393.030 because it gives you a flexibility to do a fee-for-service type construction project? And that just may give you, as the bids are coming in up higher and higher, there may be an opportunity there to look at that part of it. And then 393.103 is the older schools. So you might want to review how that has been looked at over the years if it morphed as the FCI went differently because I know that when I wrote that law, we wanted to make sure that the older schools were not neglected, that they actually got bumped up faster than just the growth that was challenging trading that. So the conversation was interesting about that part of it. But those are two things and maybe there's some tweaking that can be done to make sure that we stay with that intent, which was that the older facilities and those in minority areas were dealt with sooner than some of the new ones. Thank you. Oh, and then you have Canarelli. They're doing 3000 homes supposedly up in the southwest near Red Rock. It was in the paper two days ago. Do they notify you still as developers? We tried to get 'em to require to do certain things, but have we reviewed going back to the legislature to make them have to actually pay for more than what they ever pay for. Just something to think about. Thank you.

Brenda Talley's public comment was as follows:

Just real quick, because obviously a lot of these new fancy high schools and things go to the new growth areas that a lot of times are more affluent areas and yet some of our students that are in the lower

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

socioeconomic areas are the students that would benefit the most from the opportunities that these schools have. I know, and I'm talking about football fields and things. Rancho High School was built in 1955. I'm a graduate showing my age here in 1973, and that was the first year we had a football field. We actually shared our home games with Las Vegas High School, our biggest rival. So when it was our home game, we were still at their field. So we had a lot of times burning up fields and stuff like that. But that was a great opportunity when I hated to see Rancho torn down, but it was made into the, is it their dynamics or something program. My granddaughter at Arbor is in the biomedical one that some of these older schools to have those same opportunities. So those schools that need those opportunities the most, that most likely won't be going to college at the same percentage of some of these other areas would be graduating with a skill that they could use.

There was no additional public comment.

*Motion to recommend approval of CIP Revision 6, decision one, the site of elementary school locations one of ten.*

*Motion: Blackman Taylor*

*Second: DeFalco*

*Vote: Unanimous*

*Motion to recommend approval for Revision 6, decision two, the Innovation Academy High School in Southwest Valley.*

*Motion: Blackman-Taylor*

*Second: Williams*

*Vote: Unanimous*

*Motion to approve Revision 6, decision three that all projects scheduled to open school year 2027-2028, and all subsequent years delay by one year with the exception of Matt Kelly.*

*Motion: Flatt*

*Second: Williams*

*Vote: Unanimous*

### **2.08 Review of Regulation 7112 for Possible Amendments.**

Mr. McLaughlin presented the committee with the proposed Regulation 7112 amendments in accordance with Governance Policy (GP) 16 as an update. It will then follow the customary process contained within GP 16, which is executive leadership review and ultimately put forward to the board of school trustees for approval.

Ms. Williams thanked Mr. McLaughlin for the incredible job he is doing. She stated that the historical significance is defined is the existence of an official national, state, or local designation that governs modifications to a particular facility. She asked is designation as a redevelopment zone apply here or what do you mean by significant? 20

Mr. McLaughlin answered saying that just by reading the text of this it's saying the historical significance has a prevalence in this policy. Redevelopment areas are not explicitly mentioned here. If it's so desired from the committee in our consideration of bringing this forward, and if you would like to see that, I would just ask you to state that.

Ms. Williams said that something that should be at least discussed before making that decision to do that. Also, the number of portables verses the number of classrooms on a site.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked that regarding B1, that very last phrase will support a replacement recommendation if the facility is 50 years or older, if it is under 50 years, what would be, I guess I'm not understanding exactly why that language was added.

Mr. McLaughlin said he believed that was added merely because most buildings of ours should be lasting five years or 50 years as an anticipated lifespan.

Ms. Blackman Taylor asked that in those cases where a new building or a new addition skews the FCI number, does that need to be written into the policy to kind of make sure that we're hitting those the same way? Or do you think that language is adequate to cover a new building that would lift the average of the entire campus?

Mr. McLaughlin stated that he thinks the policy reads in line with how we're going to look at it, so I wouldn't recommend any additional amendments to it.

The floor was opened up for Public Comment.

Ms. Chris Giunchigliani: I just wanted to understand better. It sounds like the FCI, the 20% makes it a five-year rolling. That I think is what that language is doing at this point. So for example, Lundy would've qualified last year for the five-year role and wasn't done. Lundy is also a 50 year or older school. So again, if financing's needed, you should have it someplace budgeted. But in your, I think what the intent is on page two, sub two is to make sure that the older schools are recognized and don't get lost in the mix. Is that the intent of the language? That's what I'm just trying to understand. I wasn't quite sure. And then Mr. DeFalco asked about the will to may. So now if they said they just want the flexibility to do it, then how will they make a determination? If you have an identical score, there should be at least a minimum or some standard so that you just don't leave it, so to speak, in my opinion. So those are my questions. Thank you.

### **2.09 Questions and/or Removal of Items on Motions/Liaison Taskings.**

Regarding the item titled 'Analysis of District Cost Savings and Options to Provide Access to a Larger Population of Students' Ms. Williams stated that with Dr. Barton's departure, she will meet with Gia who heads up the CTE department, so I will be reaching out to her out to her to get a date so we can sit down and begin those conversations.

### **3.01 Public Comment on Items Not Listed as Action Items on the Agenda.**

Good afternoon. My name is Jenna Evans and I will be a junior at Spring Valley High School this fall. I'm here today to ask about incorporating universal design into future CCSD buildings and major renovations. Before I start, I want to give a statistic about 13% of the US population is disabled. This makes the roughly 42 million disabled individuals, one of the largest minority groups in the country. Additionally, disabled students make up about 15% of the national public school system. My younger brother, Edison is one of them. Edison has cerebral palsy, which requires him to use a wheelchair and he previously attended Bonner Elementary School. During his time there, a new building was constructed and it was a very nice building. However, the main entrance on the playground were stairs that weren't accessible for him. So in order for him to get to and from class, he and his aide would have to walk to the back of the building where it was level just to enter.

This would take longer and in some cases caused him to be late to class. This was not only a burden for Edison and his aid, but also for his ability to learn. And while this building was compliant with the

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

American's Disabilities Act, it was just not sufficient. There is a solution to this, however, and it is called Universal Design. Universal design was created in order to make infrastructure accessible for everybody. Its official definition states that it is a design that is usable by all people to the greatest extent possible without the need for special adaptation or specialized design, which means that it works towards inclusivity for all, regardless of abilities or circumstances. Universal design can be applicable to just about everything, including buildings, signage, and technological systems. And it can also be found in city infrastructure with dropdown curbs at sidewalks or automatically opening doors.

But we should strive to include all aspects of it, such as making all entrances level if designed into new construction and major remodels, it can be implemented with minimal costs, with minimal changes in cost. So why is universal design important to incorporate into the building code? For one, universal design can benefit everybody, not just people with disabilities. It's easy to use. Design can benefit older faculty members, mothers with strollers, and young children. Using universal design in our facilities can provide visual representation to the disabled students and the community as a whole of how we care about everybody's needs and not just able-bodied individuals. Additionally, the Clark County School District is the fifth largest school district in the United States, and we can help a lot of people and lead the country by requiring the principles of universal design to be incorporated into all new construction. I've had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Brendan McLaughlin and other members of the Facility Services Unit on this idea, and I'm hoping that we can continue to work towards this goal. We should strive for inclusivity within the learning environment to benefit everybody. Let's redefine the standards for CCSD. Thank you.

### **4.00 Adjourn**

*Motion to adjourn the meeting at 2:10 p.m.*

*Motion: Williams*

*Second: Blackman Taylor*

*Vote: Unanimous*